How Sartre Demonstrated for Freedom in Moscow, P. 2

Words That Flicker Like A Candle In A Gathering Storm

"Pope John recognized that the age of hiding places had come to an end. For the first time everyone inside the world enclosure was vulnerable . . . Pope John saw nuclear war as an assault against future generations . . . their right to a good earth unclotted by radioactive poisons . . . Pope John saw in the fact of a common humanity reason enough for reaching out beyond national differences to new imperatives. Nowhere in the Pacem in Terris Encyclical do I find a single word of fulmination or castigation against any nation or its institutions. I find only the vocabulary of human reconciliation."

—U Thant to Pacem in Terriss II in Geneva May 28.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. XV, NO. 20 JUNE 5, 1967 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Why Not A Global Settlement Before It's Too Late?

The first glimmer of hope in the Middle East crisis may be extinguished by the news that the U.S. is again bombing within the cities of Hanoi and Haiphong. Only joint action by the two superpowers can enforce peace in the Middle East, and the Soviets will hardly cooperate in the one area unless offered concessions in the other. This may hold the key to the secret messages which have been exchanged between Washington and Moscow. The latter seems to be taking out on Israel the humiliation Washington has imposed on it in Vietnam.

The U.S. As Poor Example

An editorial in the *New York Times* (May 31) seems to suggest that we de-escalate the war in the Far East in order to escalate it in the Near East. It says there is at stake control of the area's oil resources in which American firms have $2,500,000,000 invested, that we have "nothing comparable" in Southeast Asia and that every argument advanced for the Vietnam intervention—"commitments, honor, security, interests, consistency, the self-determination of small nations"—"could be used in favor of helping Israel." A better way of helping Israel would be to prove by our actions in the Far East the sincerity of our desire for peace in the Near East. A new world war isn't going to help anybody. It is Israel's misfortune that the one great Power on which it can call for help has been setting such a poor example. How can Johnson call for restraint when he has shown so little? How can the U.S. champion freedom of the seas in Aqaba when it has done its best to destroy the principle by blockades around Cuba and North Vietnam? How can we try to calm down Arab calls for *jihad* against Israel when we have been building up a holy war spirit of our own in years of cold war propaganda? How can we expect effective action from the United Nations when we ourselves have weakened the organization's effectiveness?

These are some of the specifics which lie behind the softly worded indictment of U Thant's message to Pacem in Terris II in Geneva, when he spoke of a growing anarchy in the world. The United States is far from being the only power in the world today which shows a disregard for international commitments. But we have certainly been providing the biggest and most terrifying examples of a readiness to shoot it out. We know too little, really, of how wars arise. We pay too much attention to the rationalizations, too little to the underlying psychic drives. What bodes ill is a general rise in the level of tension and fear. The peoples move toward war as a relief from the tension—"to get it over with." The relentless bombing day after day of one small power by one big superpower has certainly raised that level of taut readiness. It's like a fight in a barroom that becomes a general brawl because everyone jumps in to relieve their own fears and aggressions. The Arabs fear Israel, Israel fears the Arabs; Nasser fears the fate of Sukarno; Russia fears the ascendancy of a war party in the United States. In this atmosphere only a general de-escalation can save the peace.

No nation is free from blame in this crisis. Nasser is risking world war to establish his dominance in the Arab world. The Soviet Union has been playing with dynamite, in the classic fashion of power politics, by pouring arms into the area. Israel has been too ready to engage in military reprisals. Everybody has been looking for a "situation of strength" and the search has created the conditions for a general collapse. At such a moment it is every human being's duty to help restrain his own nation, tribe or grouping, not to add to the stampede

(Continued on Page Four)

An Ominous Leak

We invite attention to the disclosure in the Globe & Mail (Toronto, May 23) that Wm. Bundy, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, told a briefing for editors here May 22 that if the Chinese entered the Vietnamese war the U.S. would attack China with "everything we have". This was taken to mean all-out nuclear reprisal and "constituted" (as Canada's largest paper said) "one of the most far reaching threats ever voiced by a senior U.S. official on the question." The rules of the conference stipulated "background, not for attribution". When an NBC correspondent asked about Bundy's remark at a subsequent on-the-record State Department briefing, he was sharply reprimanded by the spokesman for doing so. Publication in the Globe & Mail frees those who were there to discuss it. We don't think so ominous a remark should go unreported in this country. Is such a threat in America's real interest? Would not a "no first strike" pledge be wiser? A resolution and debate in Congress might shake the mood that leads all of us to acquiesce fatalistically in such Strangelovian announcements of genocidal policy.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Demonstration for Freedom in Moscow and A New Propaganda Line on Greece

A Hair's Breadth Escape From Legalizing Discrimination in Housing

BY THE HAIR'S BREADTH margin of only one vote, the country has just been saved from an appalling demonstration of White Power. The Supreme Court split 5-to-4 in declaring California's Proposition 14 contrary to the 14th Amendment. This State constitutional amendment, which would have barred any governmental measures against racial discrimination in housing, was adopted 2-to-1 in 1964, and later held to be in violation of the Federal Constitution by California's Supreme Court 7-to-2. A shift of one vote on the U.S. Supreme Court would have opened the door to similar constitutional measures in other States. Black joined Harlan, Clark and Stewart in dissenting; the majority opinion by White was weak and wobbly. Douglas, concurring, really grappled with the realities and ended with a prescient quotation from Madison, warning that the real danger of future oppression lies in the majority, in this case white and racist. What happens if the Court some day reverses itself, or if a racist majority amends the Federal Constitution to make discrimination legal?

Sartre Demonstrates in Moscow

The U.S. press missed the drama at the Soviet Writers Congress when Armand Lanoux, spokesman for a French delegation of two Communists and two non-Communists protested the Siniavsky-Daniel trial. The two most important members of the delegation, Jean-Paul Sartre and Louis Aragon, stayed away from Moscow altogether to demonstrate their displeasure. (Perhaps the U.S. press hated to give Sartre credit for his independence). M. Lanoux also called for peaceful co-existence in literature, contrary to Soviet dogma, and told the Congress "Unity is passé. Divergences are the future. Cherish your differences." Sholokhov, the great Cossack writer, turned up again as a defender of party line conformity; in his old age he is riding herd on his fellow writers as Cossacks once rode herd for the Czars on their fellow workers. His special target was Ehrenbourg, who pointedly went abroad instead of attending, also as a Siniavsky-Daniel protest.

A Victory for Freedom

Ten years ago the Supreme Court speaking through Mr. Justice Frankfurter in a 5-to-4 decision ruled that a native-born Texan of Mexican parentage could be deprived of his citizenship for having voted in a foreign election, in that case Mexican. Last Monday the surviving dissenters—Warren, Black and Douglas—were joined by Brennan and Fortas in a new 5-to-4 decision which reversed that ruling in the case of a naturalized American of Polish Jewish origin who voted in an Israeli election in 1951. We believe the reversal is a landmark victory for civil liberties. The philosophic roots lie in the American Revolution and the War of 1812. It was the position of the British Crown that a subject could never renounce his allegiance; it was the American position that any man could choose his country, that expatriation was a fundamental right. In recent years, with the rise of Communism and Fascism, expatriation became a weapon of the State against dissidents or outlawed minorities; they were deprived of their passports and rendered "Stateless". Those who lived through the Hitler period know what a terrible weapon that was. In a milder form the idea has grown up here that American citizens, even native-born, might be deprived of their citizenship for certain acts. In the McCarthy period there were even proposals to impose statelessness as a penalty for "subversion." Mr. Justice Black ruled in this new case that the Fourteenth Amendment, in guaranteeing the citizenship of the newly freed Negro, protects all Americans from denaturalization.

A COMING PROPAGANDA LINE was foreshadowed by a speech in the House last Monday by Derwinski (R., Ill), a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, urging complete support of the Greek dictatorship "as a necessary step to deter Soviet-encouraged Egyptian aggression in the Middle East." He accused the Administration of "pursuing a short-sighted policy towards Greece thus adding to Free World complications in the Middle East." What could be more "complicating" than a Latin American style military dictatorship in NATO Europe?

How the Committee of Responsibility's Investigation in Vietnam Was Hampered

"Every attempt of the group to break the schedule [set up by the South Vietnamese Ministry of Health and USAID] was met with obstacles. The group was not allowed to separate nor to conduct investigations of its own. In Pleiku, Peter Franklin, former newspaperman who was the non-medical member of our team, was invited by a Vietnam Christian Service (VNCS) doctor to lunch and he went. This created a big stir. Later he went to visit the VCNS workers at Ban Me Thuot and again there was an argument with a doctor of the Ministry of Health.

"As a result, there were threats of breaking up the mission and sending us home. Dr. Lu-y [the Minister of Health] told us he could not give carte blanche to the free inquiry we had in mind. He said all persons interviewed should be within MOH facilities and in the presence of an MOH escort. The group went where it was taken, saw what it was shown. We were kept so busy we did not have adequate time to put together a meaningful report. Valuable hours were taken up with irrelevant briefings. We were in only one area where there was heavy military action, namely Danang. Due to recent changes, affecting civilians, permission to visit Quang Tri and Hue where action was heaviest, was cancelled. Only in passing comments from medical workers could we begin to glimpse the reality of the entire medical situation.

"As for the war burns, we observed that no burn cases in hospitals were over 20% third degree of the body surface. This means that few of those with any burns of over 20% make it to the hospital. Wherever there had been war action, napalm victims turned up in large numbers in the records shown us. Of the 38 war burns we saw, 13 were children. A doctor told us of two children fishing in Bac Lieu province when a plane returned the fire of a VC and hit them with phosphorus fire. They were covered from head to foot, jumped into the water for an hour. Picked up by a local bus and brought to the hospital still smoking and covered with mud, they died that night. There are children in Vietnam we saw who need care desperately and we must bring them to the U.S."

—Committee of Responsibility press release May 15 (abr).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Strange Role of Oregon's Edith Green and Her "Mini-Quie" Amendments

A Close Brush With Disaster on The New Aid to Education Bill

By A Capitol Hill Observer

For a few harrowing hours during the recent House debate on Federal aid to education, it looked as if the members, professing nothing but the loftiest motives, were about to wreck the Elementary and Secondary Eduction Act (ESEA) and repeal Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the section that empowers the government to withhold funds from any Federally-assisted program that discriminates.

The House stopped far short of that. And the grave faults it wrote into the bill may still be corrected in the Senate. But the close brush with disaster marks how far we have come from the bright days of the 89th Congress.

States Rights Republican

The ESEA was enacted in 1965, by detouring around the church-state controversy that had blocked Federal aid for more than 20 years. It did this through a formula that gives the funds directly to deprived children in local school districts, whether they go to public or parochial schools. This year, when the House Education and Labor Committee sought to improve the Act and extend it through fiscal 1969 it faced opposition from one of its Republican members, Albert Quie (*Minn.*). An amiable, well-meaning man, Mr. Quie sought to mold the Act closer to his party's ideal. He proposed to scrap the present system of grants for specific programs and, instead, make funds available in block grants to the states to spend on education as they saw fit.

Overnight, the Quie amendment became a test of the Administration's ability to get its Great Society programs through Congress. Consideration of the bill was put off for weeks while the Administration rallied opposition. Catholics who feared they would lose ESEA funds in 33 states whose constitutions prohibit aid to private schools; civil rights groups that feared Negro children would suffer if Southern state officials decided how to spend the money; educators who hated to see a promising program tampered with all lined up against Quie. It was enough to beat his amendment but not all the other threats to the bill.

These, too, came from members passionate about states rights: Southern Democrats and that liberal maverick, Edith Green of Oregon. All that happened to the ESEA cannot be blamed on her. But she did serve, as Rep. Joelson (*D., N.J.*) aptly put it, as "drum majorette" for that coalition of Republicans and Dixiecrats that is always being pronounced dead and, like the South, always seems to rise again.

On final passage the bill was saddled with troublesome amendments, most of them harmful to civil rights if they stay in: one by Rep. Fountain (*D., N.C.*) would bar the Office of Education (OE) from deferring funds for new programs in any school district it believes discriminates until it completes a hearing in the matter; one by Rep. Erlenborn (*R., Ill.*) would strike from the ESEA an authorization to continue the Teachers Corps beyond June 30; one by Mrs. Green requires OE to apply rules such as its desegregation guidelines uniformly to all 50 states; two other Green amendments, derisively termed "mini-Quies" in the corridors, would give the states control over some $600 million earmarked for innovative programs and grants to strengthen state education departments.

None is necessarily a mortal blow. The Fountain amendment would deprive OE of one of its few weapons for compelling districts to comply with the law. It was added to the ESEA last year but a House-Senate conference compromised it into harmlessness and the Senate may knock it out again. Requiring uniform application of guidelines may turn out to be meaningless. Indeed if OE is not too cowed, it might conceivably use the amendment to require a speed-up of desegregation all over the country. The Teacher Corps authorization may be saved in the Higher Education Act now before Mrs. Green's subcommittee. And giving the states control over two programs does not touch Federal control of the big money in the bill, the $2.6 billion authorization for deprived children. Another Fountain amendment that would have virtually repealed Title VI was beaten.

What suffered graver damage than the bill was morale. Government officials already cringing under Congressional criticism will be less ready than ever to push civil rights enforcement. The pity is Mrs. Green doesn't seem to know that. Her record on civil rights and education is excellent. But her antipathy to anything she feels smacks of Federal control of education appears to affect her judgment.

When it comes to school desegregation, the states cannot be treated alike. Southern states with dual school systems mean to keep them. Far from being punitive, the OE desegregation guidelines were meant to help some 2,000 Southern districts out of the 25,000 school districts in the country, move toward a single school system without losing Federal money. By aligning herself with the Southerners, Mrs. Green feeds the fallacious notion that they are being treated badly, when the mistreated ones are the Negro children—threatened, insulted and beaten when they try to go to white schools. By implying that the guidelines are administered unfairly, she strengthens the Southern argument that they are illegal, even though the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, in March, upheld their constitutionality.

But Mrs. Green is not the House. Timid leadership must share responsibility for what happened to the ESEA. One trembles at what the House will do now with the poverty program and what this may precipiate among the frustrated and disillusioned of the ghettoes and plantations.

Like More Whiskey For A Drunkard

"Who are the people who have neglected the children, that made the Federal government get into this field? The states. My state is the 6th or 7th richest in the country and it is 39th in what it does for education . . . the state department of education tried to vet every single grant for the deprived areas of Ohio and the grants had to be made around (it) . . . When we pass these amendments to give the job of administering the Federal money back to those state administrators, at least in some states I know, it is like taking a drunkard who is convicted of neglecting his children and giving him an extra $100 a month to spend on whiskey, so he can neglect them some more."

—Rep. Wayne Hays (D., O.) *during ESEA debate, May 24.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Black Sea and the Baltic Are The Soviet Union's Aqabas

(Continued from Page One)

of emotionalism. It is in this spirit that we say the U.S. has set a bad example and it is in the same spirit that we urge sober second thoughts in the world Jewish community. Even a week of war between Israel and the Arab States will cost more in suffering than decades of oil supply through Aqaba.

The Old Enemy of Both

Ben Gurion once said Israel could win two wars, perhaps three but no more; this, after 1948 and and 1956, would be the third. What if Israel destroys Aswan and Egypt destroys Tel Aviv? Even if Israel "wins," what a mountain of hatred and humiliation this would leave behind! Israel's survival depends on reconciliation with its Arab neighbors; without that, there can only be a series of wars, ending in its extinction. It may have to fight again, but restraint and restraint and more restraint is the path of wisdom. Hysterical comparisons with Hitlerism will not help. Nasser is not Hitler. This is another chapter in the struggle between Isaac and Esau, Jacob and Ishmael, and it will be fought with Biblical and fratricidal ferocity if once unleashed, and end nowhere else but in a net gain for the immemorial enemy of both, the desert.

A terrible military overconfidence is Israel's greatest weakness. It was disturbing that Ben Gurion at this moment should have to warn the Israeli army that in democratic countries the military must remain subject to the civilian power. The atmosphere is like that in an old-fashioned American movie where the landing of the Marines sets all things aright. The greatest weakness in efforts for peace is the general feeling that in a showdown the world will always sacrifice the weaker to the stronger, that the troublemaker gets the dividend of the fait accompli. This is how Israel made its gains in 1956 and fears that Nasser will make his now.

The rights and wrongs of the Arab-Israel conflict can be argued forever. As in the quarrels of children, for each grievance there is a counter-grievance. But in the tangle some threads may usefully be singled out for a settlement. Israel opened Aqaba by force in 1956 because Nasser had shut the Suez to Israeli ships in defiance of a UN resolution both East and West approved in 1951. The right of access to open waters for an enclosed sea is a fundamental one. It would be the ultimate irony if the Russians refuse to see this as their own warships come through the inland waters of the Turkish Straits into the Mediterranean in virtue of just that right, as embodied in the Montreux treaty and in international law. The Black Sea and the Baltic are to Russia what the Gulf of Aqaba is to Israel. Here too is a common interest diplomacy may exploit if there is de-escalation of tension.

Toward that end, is it too much for the world community to ask Cairo and Damascus to end their flamboyant declarations of total war in which Israel is to be destroyed? Such talk is itself a crime against peace. But the greatest crime against peace remains what we ourselves are doing in Vietnam. Mediation might become possible if we showed a readiness for a general settlement in both the East and West of Asia.

9 a.m., May 31

On The Pro-Israel Left

Fifty leading French intellectuals and university professors led by Jean-Paul Sartre have issued a manifesto (Le Figaro, May 29), affirming "that the security and sovereignty of Israel, including free navigation, are the bases of peace; that this peace is attainable; and ought to be assured by negotiations among sovereign states." The signatories declared themselves "friends of the Arabic peoples and opponents of American imperialism" but affirm Israel's wish for peace and think "incomprehensible the identification of Israel with an imperialist and aggressive camp."

Americans for Progressive Israel—Hashomer Hatzair and Canadian Friends of Pioneering Israel, both linked with the Left-labor Zionist party, Mapam, which is part of the Eshkol coalition government, were holding a convention in Montreal as we went to press. A draft resolution jointly adopted said that while Israel was "harassed" by "marauders and terrorists", retaliatory action had failed. "The answer lies not in retaliatory force," the draft resolution said, but in steps toward a four power pact to guarantee all the Middle Eastern State, and end their arms race.

The 1966 Index Is Ready—You Can Have One Free If You Send A Stamped Long Envelope For It—Please Renew, If Overdue, With Your Request

I. F. Stone's Weekly 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington, D. C. 20015

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

6/5/67

For the enclosed $5 send a gift sub to:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

Indicate if announcement wished ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except in August, the last week in December and the first week in January and Bi-Weekly during July at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $17 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED